

CHARLESTON, S.C. - Approved For Release - CIA-RDP75-00149R000400170007-6  
GAZETTE

M. 66,414  
S. 104,243  
MAR 16 1967

**EDITORIALS—**

CPYRGHT

How the Peace Corps got in the act is beyond us.

But, as long as Sen. Jackson brought the matter up, he should have told the complete story.

During the early beginnings of the Peace Corps the CIA did attempt to shape corps policies but was rebuffed by the fledgling agency's director, Sargent Shriver. Shriver quite correctly recognized the corps' effectiveness would be forever com-

promised, if it was ever learned the CIA had played a role in its activities.

This decision, in light of the latest expose of CIA escapades, speaks for itself. The surprise is Shriver was able to make the decision stick. The CIA has demonstrated a remarkable genius for muscling into and exercising undue power over governmental and private organizations whose fixed purposes are outside the realm of espionage.

Two divergent commentators — James Burnham (conservative) and James Reston (slightly left of center) — have written of the incompatibility of the CIA performing two tasks that ought to be distinctly separated.

Collecting information and executing clandestine missions, they properly argue, mustn't be managed by the same federal instrumentality. One is a routine fact finding job, the other involves highly covert, underground undertakings that should be evaluated and directed only from top levels of government.

Those charged with digging up data shouldn't also be entrusted to formulate and to supervise arcane assignments, lest on occasion, as in the disastrous Bay of Pigs debacle, information and intrigue become tangled in a single mix — the one to justify the other, or vice versa — in order to make the information previously acquired look reliable, which may or may not be the case. In short, consigning a chicken coop to the stewardship of a fox is risky nonsense.

# Espionage, Data Gathering Definitely Incompatible

Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., has defended the CIA's action of disbursing funds to various student groups, saying the agency didn't seek to influence those receiving its bounty.

"There were no strings attached," declared the senator.

That raises an interesting question.

If no strings were attached, why did the CIA give handouts to some student organizations and not to others?

From the evidence uncovered, the CIA seems to have been extremely generous with groups whose policies and philosophies were located considerably left of center. No donations apparently were made to groups which looked to conservative spokesmen for guidance and inspiration.

As the result of this oversight, the CIA is now being harshly criticized by those who formerly were its warmest, staunchest supporters. And, in fairness, these critics have justifiable cause for complaint.

Conservative associations would likely have found CIA largesse as welcome as

their opposite numbers across the ideological fence. Despite disclaimers, we think the odds are prohibitive that had the money been offered, traditional conservative principles would have been stretched to allow the money to be taken, but admittedly we're biased.

In any event whether conservatives would or wouldn't have accepted the charity isn't the issue. What is the absolutely correct complaint of conservatives that their government dispensed tax money to their sworn enemy, which the latter then profitably used to stamp out conservatives and all they stood for.

It's to be doubted the CIA underwrote student groups for no reason. It is far more likely funds were given with a quid pro quo in mind. The fact no quid pro quo was forthcoming simply testifies to the absurdity of the experiment and possibly to the ineptitude with which the experiment was handled.

Sen. Jackson further noted, almost gratuitously the way we read it in a news dispatch: "I know of no instances in which the Peace Corps has been influenced in any manner, shape or form by the CIA."